

The Committee of Inquiry met at 10 a.m. June 29th for the purpose of hearing Mr. John Kaye's recollections of the events surrounding the Selection of a President against the recommendations of the Faculty Committee.

Mr. Kaye recounted the following:

Q. There is in the file the handwritten notes of your visit to Princeton.

A. Yes, I'll stick by it.

Q. One of the things which bothers the Committee is that up until the last few days persons were offered the position of the Presidency. What is your opinion of this?

A. Perhaps they were not really offers. Mr. Ellison might be saying, "Would you wish to be considered for the position?"

Q. Some of these were actually written letters which the interviewees showed us.

A. Were they actual offers?

Q. Mr. Kraus said he had information on one person who was approached only ten days to two weeks of the time that the statement had been made by Ellison that the list had now boiled down to three names. One from a person who has not been mentioned at all. Subsequently he heard of two more who were quite clearly and deliberately urged by Ellison.

A. I still say, did he actually offer the job? Mr. Ellison wanted everyone to want the job. Mr. Ellison did not commit himself to just three persons even at that late date. It was before that, at the Committee meeting on May 20th, that the Board stated they would have a decision by June 5.

Mr. Kaye said the Committee's concern was that the job would be offered to someone without their knowledge. Mr. LeBlanc said he had seen such a letter.

Mr. Wood said he had seen one that had come near enough to being an offer as to really prejudice the issue and which made it difficult to offer a contrary report.

Mr. Davison mentioned a letter and dossier on Elliott which was sent special delivery to at least two members of the Board of Trustees. One member of the Board said he received this letter and said so. This was before the Faculty Committee returned from Maine.

(There was some discussion here of Mr. Morris and Mr. Phillips having attended the meeting of the Trustees and Faculty Committees (although not as members) and so would not need to have the letter and of Mr. Hughes having gone to New York to see Elliott and therefore not needing to have the letter either.)

The above mentioned letter was said to say that Elliott probably would be the candidate offered the presidency at the June 5 meeting.

Mr. Kaye said it might be well to talk to Allan Carter or one of the other people said to have been approached at the end.

Q. When you announced the criteria to the Board, was there any discussion of them? That is to say, did the Board members indicate they knew about them?

A. These criteria were transmitted by letter.

Q. Someone said Ellison had stated that the criteria would be "all right."?

A. Mr. Kaye said the Board's reception of them was "lukewarm." Sort of a lukewarm discussion that these were acceptable. Nothing important.

Q. Do you think it would have been desirable to pursue or push this point?

A. What would you push?

Q. Some say that the criteria were so abstract and vague that these people (Board Committee) would not have time to discuss such principles?

A. My feeling was that we would operate within these specifications. Mr. Kaye said he thought they were acceptable and there was nothing to push.

Q. Might it not have been wise to inquire earlier whether these seemed conducive to a common search and if not, whether they wished to qualify them, add to them, or take away from them? It would have been an excellent thing to have.

A. Not having received any unpleasant comments, we assumed they were acceptable.

Q. The Board seemed to have opportunities to communicate. What did they communicate about? Did the Faculty Committee have any impact on them?

A. Yes, we had an impact until Courtland Perkins turned us down.

(Here Professor Davison spoke about Mr. Ellison's rebuff of Professor St. Cyr in the matter of J. Perkins)

Q. A question followed about "showing some agreement between the Committees" but the Secretary could not hear it.

A. Shortly after that the situation began to disintegrate with the Committee having been asked to advocate Mr. Brown. Should the Committee advocate him or not?

Q. The Secretary did not hear this question either.

A. Both. Earlier there was a statement we have a man here _____

Q. Did you feel pressure from the Deans and Chairman?

A. The job of the Committee was to get an acceptable candidate.

Q. Did you think this seriously handicapped the Committee?

A. It raised this question, should they try to make the Committee their tool for doing this or should they have worked through the Committee?

Q. Did you know that the Board of Trustees was being pressured about John A. Brown?

A. I became aware of that later.

Q. Do you think that any member of the Board _____ in this pressure for John A. Brown.

A. The only person from whom I heard it was from Ellison around the end. I gathered there was also a man (?) earlier.

Q. Do you think Mr. Ellison became very exercised and upset?

A. He raised his voice and became very excited at times.

Q. Did he seem at all ill etc. ?

A. Mr. Kaye did not c^urry those impressions.

Q. Do you recall at any of the very occasional meetings your committee had that any other Board members other than Mr. Ellison took an active part?

A. Most of the time it was Ellison. Sometimes Mr. Hughes.

Q. What about the telephone call to Ransom. Did any member of the Board say someone on the Committee had made this?

A. There was something about this, but no one admitted it at the time.

Q. Did you know about an earlier call?

A. Just the one from the Chemistry Department (or to the Chemistry Department).

Q. What about the Airlie House call?

A. Someone later reported that some member of the Committee had some conversations with someone in Texas. There was no extensive reference to it if there was.

Q. Did D. C. Green ever say anything about participating in the Ransom matter?

A. Probably Arthur Miller contacted him through the Committee.

Q. Did anyone of the Trustees Committee named McKee make any impression on you?

A. Just that he was a member of their Committee. Most of the time he was quiet. Most of the time all the members were quiet.

Q. Was Mrs. Graham active at the meetings.?

A. She spoke about Perkins.

We tended to feel that after our presentation on Courtland Perkins, they were very impressed and tended to express themselves. The fact that we could present some detailed information with respect to our being in favor of him impressed them.

Q. Did you relate these to the criteria?

A. Our presentation related rather carefully to our discussions and findings.

Q. The criteria were brought in on Elliott?

A. They said they got the message before on Princeton when Schmidt and Brown thought it would be desirable to center all this detail around the criteria. Mr. Kaye says he does not know what they did at the full Board presentation.

Q. Your Committee was less effective from an "insiders" point of view?

A. It was less effective when Brown attended the Deans and Chairmen's meeting and the Faculty Committee was being used for another purpose.

Q. Was there a vote of confidence in Dr. Brown after this meeting?

A. There was a vote of confidence in a sense. We had confidence in Dr. Brown but the Committee could no longer function effectively.

A great many personal comments began to be exchanged after this.

Q. The first few months were lost because the Board of Trustees was interested in Rusk, McNamara, etc. This was communicated very early to your Committee. Was there any critical pressure about those names by your Committee. Some people suggested that although it was interesting, it would lead to no result?

A. We were given to understand that they would like to get one of these individuals and we treaded water until they could find out. The Committee decided Rusk and some of the others would be acceptable.

Q. When did the "great man" search come to an end.

A. After the inauguration probably.

Q. Are you aware of the financial situation - about how much the salary is?

A. It is usually referred to as one of the highest. He thought about \$40,000.

Q. Was Dr. Brown a good chairman?

A. Tom Brown, Mr. Kaye said, was a good chairman basically. We were usually able to work things out.

Q. What is the function of such a Committee. What about loyalty to the group. Should a smaller committee be formed?

A. Mr. Kaye thought it would be desirable.

Q. Should there be a permanent type of group formed?

A. Mr. Wood stated Mr. Kaye had submitted a memorandum to him along these lines.

Q. Mr. Davison said he meant a presidential Committee?

A. The Faculty Committee was cohesive until May.

Q. Did the Trustees Committee seem to work as hard as the Faculty Committee? (The Secretary did not hear this question but the answer seems to suggest it.)

A. Yes, Ellison did most of their work. The Trustees were glad to have him do this.

Q. Would you say it was fair to state that under these circumstances the Faculty Committee got to know the Trustees as individuals or the other way around?

A. Mr. Kaye said it tended to be a very formal relationship.

Q. They seem easy to communicate with?

A. It was evident to us that Ellison turned down our request to have our representatives appear before the Board. Maybe Morris will be different. He (Mr. Kaye) thinks Hughes prevailed upon Mr. Ellison (to let them come.)

One of the communication problems which was apparent is the feeling that in effect the Faculty can dictate to the Board whom they can have. This is "sticky" when people have such a thought.

Mr. Kaye then asked if anyone had questioned Mr. Morris about the WTOP interview about the only objection to President Elliott was that some thought he did not have enough experience.

The committee replied it had not done so, but perhaps it should have.

Professor Davison said they had asked about the vote, and Mr. Kaye asked if there was any question of conflict within the group of Trustees. Mr. Wood said no one had indicated this.

Professor Davison then described the meeting of the Deans and discussed ^{a Dean's} Hamblin's having gone to Acting President Colclough thereafter and Mr. Hughes' having been despatched to New York.

Mr. Kraus and Mr. Wood saw Mr. Ellison later to try to clarify things and asked about the urgency.

Mr. Kaye said he tended to think that some of it was caused by some going along on separate interim leadership and others for real leadership.

Mr. Kraus said the Chairman of the Board and the Vice Chairman said they never saw the Dean's report (Basic Considerations, etc.) It was stated here that if they ever did it would upset their neatly balanced set of books. After further discussion of this report, Professor Kaye thought it should be distributed to the Faculty.

Q. From your own point of view, how would you limit the Trustees' responsibility? Should the code contain such limitations?

A. Mr. Kaye said at this moment he could only say that the Board should not force a President on the Faculty whom they did not want.

Mr. Kaye said he wondered if the Board had been misled into thinking the Faculty would go along on Elliott by some innocuous remark like "we will go along, etc." (This appeared to have reference to Dr. Brown's statement at the end of his report to the Trustees about accepting the decision etc.)

There was some discussion here of relations in the Committees, and Mr. Kaye said he would not say there was any desire to provoke a quarrel. There was, however, a desire to try to force the Committee to come up with orderly procedures. When it was mentioned that Mr. Arthur Miller was depressed by the lack of orderly procedures, Mr. Kaye said Mr. Miller was not the strongest advocate of them.

Mr. Kraus said he had approached Dr. Brown and suggested to him that the Senate would be most willing to provide him with an opportunity to discuss some of the formal problems so that the Senate could be thought of as a "watch dog" of procedures. Mr. Brown said he would not want to do this unless he discussed it with the Committee.

Mr. Kaye replied that he remembered one or two times when this was brought up and it was thought to be not necessary. If the Senate had something to tell them they could tell them.

In reply to a remark about Acting President Colclough's remarks about not having been asked for any assistance to the Committee, Mr. Kaye said he did not recall any discussions about the Acting President. He was the intermediate of the Board.

Q. Do you think you were deceived by the Board?

A. I tended to take the middle position. I wanted to watch and wait. Some individuals wanted to force things down the throat of the Board. The attitude was that the Board was not reliable and was not doing the sorts of things they should. Early in the game fears were voiced about the Board going out and getting people on their own. How it could act toward the detriment of the committee.

(There is a statement here "toward the end there was a statement put in on that, we had a chance to investigate him on the campus." The secretary does not have any question recorded)

Q. Apparently the Trustees have made a clear record for themselves?

A. Mr. Kaye said he tended to say that the Board was acting in good faith, but he did not want to step out of line with the Committee.

Q. Certain members of your Committee think they were deceived by the Board?

A. Mr. Kaye said he seemed to be taking the side of the Board. He had the feeling that if the Board forced them into a decision, they should stand up on their hind legs and tell the Faculty Assembly.

Mr. Kaye wondered to what extent the final result might not be attributed to pique on the part of Mr. Ellison when he did not want Mr. Brown. He said the Board will not accept Brown. Mr. Kaye feels he made it quite explicit.

Q. What was the sense of identifying Brown on the May list then. Should you not have determined earlier whether this was just a formality? Had this not been a sufficiently clear-cut fact that Brown was out? Should you not have asked if he was a genuine candidate?

A. The viewpoint was we were looking for someone better than Brown. When there is sufficiently strong advocacy of a person, you just "rack up" his name again.

Q. If your impression was shared by others, it is hard to say how clearly defined that decision was, or if it was the thought of the whole Committee?

A. We endeavored to see Ellison to see if this was the feeling of the whole Board or just Mr. Ellison.

Mr. Kaye said when they met Elliott they were favorably impressed. He (Mr. Kaye) left the luncheon early and did not hear him say the remark about "The trustees are the boss etc." When he left the luncheon he was impressed with Dr. Elliott. He made the point that the Committee later met and did not turn him down as a result of the meeting and they must have felt something if they sent some members to Maine. If they still wanted to go to Maine, they must have been impressed. That was probably what Ellison thought. As Mr. Kaye remembered, he was shocked to hear the unfavorable report from Maine (Apparently he meant Mr. Ellison was shocked)

Q. Could you put your finger on any point that was crucial in the case of J. Perkins and was equally crucial in the case of Elliott.

A. Mr. Kaye tended to feel that both these men were _____. There was a difference in the circumstances in which the statements about them were made. There was no pressure in the J. Perkins case, but there was in Dr. Elliott's case to terminate the search.

Q. There was a question of "autocracy" in both cases?

A. The conciseness of the reports was different. In the Elliott case there was much discussion about appointments he had made etc. There was too much peripheral information.

(There was discussion here of a report on Mr. J. A. Brown which was judged to be outside the jurisdiction of this Committee to discuss)

(There was a brief discussion about the formation of a standing committee to deal with elections of presidents, what the ground rules should be within such a Committee and then within the Trustees committee; and what the functions and behavior of the Committee should be)

Mr. Kaye asked if this present committee was familiar with the report from the Council on Education dealing with these matters and was told that the Committee was familiar with it.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

*Note memo. attached
from Mr Kaye to the
Committee on May 14, 1965*

Personal & Confidential

May 14, 1965

To: Faculty Committee to Advise and Consult on the
Selection of a President

Re: Committee Membership

Until the task of selection is completed, I believe that this committee (or any successor) must, among other things, be such as to merit its acceptance by the faculty, the trustees, and prospective or actual candidates for the vacancy as a responsible body capable of impartial judgment of qualifications of candidates.

It is highly improbable that a committee will be given such acceptance if it includes individuals who have openly advocated a specific candidate for the position. On one hand, a prospective or actual candidate would be justified in refusing or withdrawing candidacy, respectively, rather than submitting himself to such a group for evaluations. On the other hand, the Board of Trustees could claim that the faculty conducted itself irresponsibly in the selection activity by continuing or designating such a group. The Board could, then, feel free to disregard the counsel of such a committee, to the detriment of the principle of faculty participation in selection.

John Kaye

*Recd from
Mr. Brown 15 July
1965*

The Committee of Inquiry met with Mr. John Anthony Brown, Jr. at 9.30 a.m. June 25th for the purpose of getting his recollections of the circumstances leading to the selection of Dr. Elliott against the wishes of the Faculty Committee. Mr. Wood, Mr. Kraus and Mr. Davison were present.

Mr. Brown recounted the following:

The problem for him began on July 27, 1964 upon President Carroll's death when he returned from Brazil and called the Chairman of the Board and expressed his feelings. The Chairman replied that he had appointed Admiral Colclough Acting President and the Board of Trustees would confirm the appointment on the afternoon of President Carroll's funeral. This was in response to Mr. Brown's simple courteous statement, "If there is anything I can do to be helpful..." Mr. Brown thought he almost said "We do not need any help from you. We have taken this step." He responded by asking if they had cleared this with the Deans and the Executive Committee of the Senate. Everyone knew that Admiral Colclough was ill at that time - and seriously ill - and that if Mr. Ellison had gone deeper into the matter, he would have seen the tremendous responsibility this placed on the Provost's shoulders. Mr. Ellison stated he did not have to clear it with anyone. Since then, the Provost stated to Mr. Brown that they told him within an hour of the time he arrived at the Tracy Place house on the morning of President Carroll's death.

The second statement Mr. Brown would make in this regard is that when the Faculty Committee was elected and the Board Committee selected, he was told by the Acting President at that time that there would not be joint meetings of these committees. Mr. Brown protested that this seemed to be wrong. He pointed out that the committees will not be looking for the same kind of man unless they understood each other's criteria. The Acting President said that Mr. Ellison would serve as liaison between the two committees.

When the search began, and the names were being considered, Mr. Brown thought it his business to quietly inform Mr. Ellison that he thought the decision to look outside and see who was available in the terms of reference to which the two committees agreed was a good one.

Q. Did the Board agree to this?

A. Mr. Brown assumed that out of that meeting would come understanding of the type of man they were looking for.

Q. You know about the criteria?

A. Yes.

Mr. Brown then stated that there was a long pause in which the committees heard little except rumors about Rusk, McNamara, etc. Mr. Brown said that as he had mentioned very early in this account that on some occasion, talking to Mr. Ellison, he had said, "Just so you know my position, I think your idea of seeing who is available from outside is commendable."

Mr. Brown said that when it got into the Fall he began to hear rumors and even direct reports that Mr. Ellison believed and stated that he had organized a campaign to become President. Some of these reports came from strangers. Mr. Brown said that a Mr. Ellis White who is a sort of consultant who finds executives for various types of situations (even University Presidents) called on Mr. Ellison to offer his services. He was told by Mr. Ellison that Mr. Brown had organized a campaign and he was being flooded with letters. He said that Mr. Ellison stated this as a fact. Mr. White reported the conversation directly to Mr. Brown, probably in early December. Ellis White had his curiosity aroused by this. He is a friend of Theodore Distler. Mr. White talked to Mr. Distler about this. Mr. White said that Mr. Ellison had a fixation about Mr. Brown. "He is almost incoherent about him." Mr. Distler had told Mr. White to talk directly to Mr. Brown. He told Mr. Brown he might just as well leave The George Washington University. Mr. Brown allowed Mr. White to put his name up for President of a new non-profit educational corporation being set up in educational research. Ironically, Mr. Brown said he was offered that position and was required to accept it on Friday, June 4, 1965. Mr. Ellison made all sorts of calls on people like Logan Wilson who gave Mr. Brown the same information that Mr. White had given him - that Mr. Ellison stated that he had a campaign going.

Mr. Brown called on Mr. Ellison. He told him he knew he was saying this and that he deeply resented it. He asked him to give him any proof of his ever having sought

anyone to write even one letter. Mr. Ellison agreed with Mr. Brown and said the number of letters received had grown so large that he knew Mr. Brown could not have done this. Mr. Brown told him he would say no more about it, but that he would be back if he heard about it again.

Mr. Ellison asked about the Acting President's health at this Conference, which was quite amicable. He (Mr. Ellison) remarked that a new President must be selected by the June meeting of the Board. He said people had been putting pressure on him on Mr. Brown's behalf. "Your friends are your worst enemy," was a statement Mr. Ellison made. The meeting was on March 11, 1965. He said Mr. Brown would not be considered until the outside search had been given up. Mr. Brown said he only went to see him about Mr. Ellison's repeated statement that he had started a "campaign".

By that time several outside people had been interviewed. Mr. Brown was indignant about the part he was given in these interviews. At the first meeting with a candidate Mr. Brown was asked to go in the President's limousine around the campus. He said it was like giving a guided tour. "This is Lisner, this is the School of Government, this is so and so." Mr. Brown expressed himself strongly to President Colclough that this was absolutely ridiculous. While he (Mr. Brown) did not always agree with President Carroll, he liked him. President Carroll had told Mr. Brown that he had been misled about the problems at this University. The same situation would happen again if these people (candidates) were not shown the facilities, Mr. Brown believed.

(Mr. Brown spoke off the record about his cordial relations with the Carrolls)

Mr. Brown said that the procedure in these cases was to take the candidate and ride him around the campus, then Mr. Herzog and Mr. Brown met him for half an hour or less, and then met the deans. Mr. Brown thought this was absurd. Nothing very constructive transpired in that period of time. It was a series of social visits, with a few remarks that we had students from foreign countries and that the University had operated in the black for thirty years.

It was at this time that Acting President Colclough and Mr. Brown had the only real clash they have ever had. Mr. Brown protested the procedure, declared it was designed to "cover up" our problems. Mr. Brown said he did not want to go on the "tour" of the campus in the car. The Acting President

followed the suggestion, and never invited Mr. Brown to go again.

As the search moved along, they came to the interview with Courtland Perkins. Mr. Brown had six minutes and Mr. Brown decided to go with him over to the Deans and listen. Mr. Perkins had asked the right questions in the six minutes and had really aroused Mr. Brown's curiosity. Mr. Brown made it his business to say that he would like to take Mr. Perkins over to the Deans and stay a while. "No, indeed", he said (the secretary thinks this refers to Acting President Colclough). After the interview with Perkins, Mr. Brown was approached by a member of the Faculty Committee who asked him his reactions and he said that he had not had time to make up his mind in six minutes. He said that Mr. Perkins had made one statement which alarmed him to the effect that GW was "In the midst of all the money in the world." Mr. Brown was asked if he could work with Mr. Perkins and Mr. Brown replied he did not know but he was inclined to try, if he wanted him to.

Shortly after this (the dates were available but Mr. Brown did not have them with him) the Faculty Committee asked him to come as a candidate as they were interviewing other people. He did that. Not all of the committee were present, but it was a good evening. He had an opportunity to explain some of the problems of the University as he saw them and suggest some solutions to them.

Q. Do you know if anyone on the Faculty Committee had seen the Dean's report?

A. Mr. Brown said he did not believe anyone had by that time. He could almost state that as a fact because he referred to this planning and this report and the Chairman indicated he would like to have a copy of the report. Mr. Brown's mission was to try to get this academic long-range plan to the Board of Trustees. He believed then and still believes it lays a positive course for the University.

(Professor Davison said the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Board were very anxious to read it.)

Mr. Brown said he knows why they do not have it. The fact is that the Acting President said that what should happen to this report is that it should be buried. Mr. Brown said that the committee could ask any dean who was present at the Academic Policy meeting to verify the statement that the thing that should be done with it is to bury it.

Q. Did the Acting President explain his reasons for this statement?

A. No, he did with Mr. Brown but not with the deans. Dean Mason asked what was going to be done with the report? Is it going to be given to the full Board of Trustees, and the President said he hoped it was buried. The report was submitted to the Chairman, Academic Policy Committee of the Board, Mr. Carmichael for his committee. He never distributed these copies. Mr. Brown was invited to this committee and the committee meeting consisted of Mr. Carmichael, Mr. Ellison, and himself. *The Acting President* It became clear that the report was not going to get into the hands of the trustees and it has not. Unofficially, it has to several members. Once Mr. Brown found out that Mr. Carmichael did not give copies to his committee, Mr. Brown felt the responsibility to see that they had these copies. As we got deeper into the Spring there was considerable consternation on the part of the people interviewing candidates because of the disparity and variety of people coming through. There seemed to be no common denominator. There was a man from Berkeley (Dupree) who had very little administrative experience. We had had a tentative agreement to appoint him as a history professor but he didn't accept. Wood Gray did not say why. Then came John Wilson of the National Science Foundation who told Mr. Brown the position required someone who would get more money than he knew how to get and requested the Faculty Committee not to take him seriously. This sequence of heterogeneous people began to have an impact on the deans because they are worried about their schools. Several of the deans are deeply disturbed. They feel there is a crisis in their schools. Dean Mason fears the Engineering School will lose its accreditation in 1967. Dean Linton feels there are serious academic problems involving general accreditation. Dean Parks had a deadline for major corrections in his program. That School will be surveyed and drastic action will be taken unless progress is made in two years.

The deans began to be dismayed when wherever they went they heard that Mr. Ellison had offered people the Presidency. Mr. Brown said he doubted he really offered them the Presidency but many people confuse an invitation to be considered with an offer. Bailey of Syracuse, Allan Carter of the American Council both talked to people here. Carter to Brown and Burns. Many said Mr. Ellison and John McKee kept pounding the desk and saying that the University is in the black. It just needed a man to be its President. This is the "Marvin concept" held by the people on the Board.

By early May, we had come down to a position where Perkins, offered the job, said he would not take it. Mr. Ransom was next. Mr. Brown was very impressed with Ransom. He was the first one he joined the deans in approving. Mr. Brown was proud of the deans questions and of Mr. Ransom's replies. Ransom stated he would not allow his name to be on the list for more than 10 days unless he could meet with the Faculty Committee. He answered the questions intelligently. There was reluctance to get in touch with him because they might stir up the rumor in Texas that he was leaving.

Q. What about Dave Green of the Law School. He saw him. Had him as his dinner guest?

A. I know nothing about that.

Mr. Brown called Mr. Ellison and stated that he thought this man was outstanding and if he could be secured, he thought he was fine and if he wanted to work with Mr. Brown, he would be glad to stay. Mr. Brown told Mr. Ellison he was very impressed. Mr. Ellison wanted to keep on talking. Two or three times Mr. Ellison thanked him for having done this.

Ransom wrote a letter to the Faculty Committee which was looked on as a stupid letter in which he heaped praise on the President and Chairman of the Board for what they had done.

Mr. Brown spoke to Stevens, LeBlanc and Walker. He had heard a rumor that they did not want to interview him (Ransom). They thought he talked too much, etc. Mr. Brown said that Texans talked like that. He has brought a lot of money to Texas so he believed they should go ahead and interview him. We then learned that Mr. Ransom was out of the picture. Mr. Brown thought he was toying with this position to impress his own Board of Trustees. President Colclough read a telegram to the deans from him.

Q. What about the call from Airlie House?

A. John Paul Carter knew him (Ransom) very well. They were close personal friends. During the Assembly at Airlie, Carter picked up from the Deans the extent of enthusiastic support for him that had developed. Whether he called or not, Mr. Brown did not know. It was after Ransom had withdrawn in any case. Mr. Brown had indicated to the Faculty Committee and the Deans that he would be delighted to work with him.

Following that information, they had information that Dr. Elliott was coming. Dr. Elliott arrived in the 28th May for an interview.

Q. Do you know when he was first contacted?

A. Mr. Brown would think two or three weeks prior to that.

Mr. Elliott came. Mr. Brown said he could not be too dramatic in his language to describe the impact. The interview was embarrassing. Mr. Brown joined all the Deans. Dr. Elliott showed no understanding about the University at all, its strengths and weaknesses. He knew nothing about other institutions in Washington at all. It was closer to being a rude meeting. He had come to us with no prior information about the institution. "My present idea is that he was briefed by Mr. Hughes."

(Mr. Brown then read a letter he had written to Acting President Colclough about Mr. Elliott dated May 28, 1965 - copy attached)

Following that meeting, the deans became close to despair or panic that they were interviewing a man on this level. It was following this that the deans, without Mr. Brown being present, got together and signed the statement that Mr. Brown's qualifications were superior to either Coles or Elliott. (In the frame of reaction to the interview with Elliott). There were two deans who had never endorsed Mr. Brown at all. Deans Hamblin and Mason both signed the letter.

When the statement had been prepared and signed, Arthur Burns came in with a copy of it and stated it was going to be released to all members of the Board of Trustees. "I am sure Dean Burns will confirm that I said it should be taken to Mr. Ellison," Mr. Brown stated.

(Here Professor Davison described Dean^a ~~Hamblin's~~ ^{alleged} visit to the Acting President after this meeting)

Following Mr. Elliott's visit and this endorsement, Mr. Brown became really concerned because he felt Mr. Elliott was not the right man. He had been told by the Acting President that Elliott's name had been urged on the University by one New York foundation. Then about May 28 he became personally involved. He called his friend at the Ford Foundation (James Armsey) whom he knew very well. He told him the morale

of the institution had "gone to hell" because we have just interviewed a man who is not qualified to be President and we had been told someone at the Ford Foundation had urged him upon us. Armsey said this was not the case. He said they did not know Elliott. "We don't recommend or urge anybody." The most they did was to give a list of people. He said Mr. Ellison had been there (to the Ford Foundation) again and again and again and they had given him names, but had never really recommended anyone to him.

He called the Rockefeller Foundation; the name did not come from them. Mr. Brown got exactly the same story. They were asked every day by Trustees looking for Presidents to give them names and were reluctant because if they gave a name, they expected money for the Foundation if the man is selected. When Newell Ellison came to Mr. Logan Wilson, he gave him Mr. Brown's name and Mr. Ellison pointed his finger at Mr. Wilson and said, "He is out!" This was early in the fall of 1964; "I pointed out how dangerous it is to give out names."

Q. Some people have described Mr. Ellison as a "nice old man". What is your impression?

A. The impression Mr. Ellison gives is of a rather charming old gentleman who was very distressed by this problem. "He was spending seventy per cent of his time on this search, and how difficult it was." He talked to Allan Carrter about salary of \$45,000. He had given him the story about how we were "in the black"; and he talked to Douglass Cater at the White House; and he had John Corson to lunch and begged him to let his name be presented to the Board about ten days before Elliott was elected.

What Elliott does not know is that down to the end of May Mr. Ellison was still asking people to be on the list - Babbidge and John Corson were approached right down to that time.

"Allan Carrter told me with considerable contempt (my loyalty to the University is such that I was upset by his attitude) about how Mr. Ellison described how we have been able to buy real estate and all sorts of things that we were able to do because we were 'in the black'."

Q. On May 20th several members of the Board met with three people to discuss the position of President.

A. Yes, they met me in the morning and met Charles Nutting and Meredith Crawford in the afternoon.

Q. The Board Committee met with only half of its members present?

A. In the interview with me, Mrs. Graham, Mr. Ellison, Admiral Strauss, Watson Wise and John McKee were present. This was just perfunctory. They seemed to feel they had to do this to keep the record clear. Mrs. Graham asked some good questions. They opened the door to let me say some of the things about University conditions and what we should do to improve them. Strauss did not say a word through the whole interview. Mr. McKee made several remarks when I talked about a massive building program. I did not take the interview seriously.

In the last ten days there was a flood of information such as Professor Kraus, Dean Burns and I each got from Allan Carrter. I became convinced that serious fundamental harm to our University was being done.

Q. Did you have the feeling that Mr. Ellison was not a well man in the last weeks or months.

A. I do not believe that I noticed it...

Mr. Brown said it seemed crystal clear to him that the Faculty Committee was looking for one kind of man who could give leadership of the sort which would get the University moving. The Trustees evidently feel there is no need for the President to assume responsibility to raise large sums of money.

In response to a question about student reactions to Mr. Brown's candidacy, Mr. Brown said that Mr. Gnehm told him the Student Council wanted to pass a resolution to endorse him as President, or have a mass meeting, or anything else it could do before vacation time started. Mr. Brown said, "No, this is not the way a University elects a President." He told Mr. Gnehm to go quietly to Mr. Ellison by himself. He went and came back and told Mr. Brown that Mr. Ellison could not be moved. He said he was unalterably opposed to Mr. Brown.

(There was general discussion about when Dr. Elliott arrives which was declared not pertinent to Mr. Brown's statement).

Mr. Brown stated in conclusion that he was not bitter; he was shocked at the way the search had been conducted.

(There was a general discussion here which was declared not a part of Mr. Brown's statement concerning the investigation)

May 28, 1965

To: Acting President Colclough

From: John Anthony Brown, Jr.

In response to your request this morning that you would like to be able to convey to the trustees our impression of Mr. Elliott, who was our guest from Maine today, I give you a brief statement of my views.

It quickly became apparent that Mr. Elliott had come to us without making any significant effort to learn the basic facts which are readily available from standard publications about our institution. The questions he asked and the answers he gave led me to believe he is not fully acquainted with the problems of private, urban universities.

Although I left the interview after 45 minutes has transpired, I felt that there was not the same strength of leadership in this man that we found in at least two other visitors. He did not have the articulate capacity to discuss problems of higher education or pose good questions about higher education that one looks for, and that his own education, which seems to be rather restricted to institutions which were not in large cities, provides him with a heavy handicap in understanding our kind of institution.

These are candid and hurried remarks, given to you for whatever use you care to make of them. I have not discussed Mr. Elliott with my colleagues, nor do I intend to.

John Anthony Brown, Jr.

(Dictated but not read)